

REMARKS

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 12, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Reitmeier patent.

The Reitmeier patent shows in FIG. 5 a channel selection routine 500 that is used to identify, based on the input of a user, a new channel to be selected. The channel selection routine 500 is entered at step 510 when the first digit of a channel selection is entered by a user. An on-screen display is updated at 515 to indicate the entered digit. Upon receipt of the second digit at step 520, a query is made at step 522 as to whether the channel reference indicated by the first and second channel digits comprises a direct channel reference or an indirect channel reference.

A direct channel reference is a channel directly identified by the first and second digits as entered by the user. Thus, if a user presses a "1" and then a "2," the direct channel is channel "12." However, an indirect channel reference is a channel that has been remapped. Thus, the channel previously known as channel "12" has been remapped to, e.g., channel "57." The remapping function may be implemented as a lookup table. The lookup table may be updated using an electronic

program guide information and other information contained within the received information streams (e.g., program allocation table and program map table information). Additionally, lookup table may be updated using PSIPs.

If the channel reference is a direct channel reference, the tuner is tuned to a physical channel having a signal frequency corresponding to the user entered digits. If the channel reference is an indirect channel reference, the user entered digits are remapped to a direct channel reference by use of the look up table and the tuner is tuned to a physical channel having a signal frequency corresponding to the remapped direct channel reference.

Accordingly, there is no replacement of data as required by independent claim 9.

More specifically, independent claim 9 is directed to a method of replacing a data component identifying a first selected channel with a data component identifying a second selected channel. The data component identifying the first selected channel is contained in a PSIP data table received in a digital television signal, and the first selected channel is different from the second selected channel. The method involves finding the data component identifying the first

selected channel in the PSIP data table received in the digital television signal, and modifying the digital television signal by replacing the data component identifying the first selected channel with the data component identifying the second selected channel.

Thus, independent claim 9 involves modifying the PSIP in the electrical signal that contains the PSIP. The Reitmeier patent does not disclose modifying the PSIP in an electrical signal. Instead, the Reitmeier patent discloses a tuning system in which channel information is stored in a look up table so that when a user selects a virtual channel, the tuner is instead tuned to the physical channel that corresponds to the virtual channel in the look up table. In other words, the look table stores the concordance between virtual channels and corresponding physical channels. This table is stored and updated based on an electronic programming guide or PSIP channel information.

Accordingly, because the Reitmeier patent does not disclose modifying the PSIP in an electrical signal, the Reitmeier patent does not anticipate independent claim 9.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Citta patent.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a digital television signal translator comprising a tuner, a demodulator, a data replacer, and a modulator. The tuner is tuned to receive an RF digital television signal on a first selected television channel. The demodulator provides a baseband television signal from the RF digital television signal to which the tuner is tuned, and the baseband television signal includes a data component identifying the first selected channel. The data replacer modifies the baseband television signal by replacing the data component identifying the first selected channel with a data component identifying a second selected channel different from the first selected channel. The modulator modulates the baseband television signal including the data component identifying the second selected channel for transmission as a digital television signal on the second selected channel.

The Reitmeier patent does not disclose a data replacer that modifies a baseband television signal by replacing a data component identifying a first selected channel with a data component identifying a second

selected channel different from the first selected channel.

The Citta patent likewise does not disclose such a data replacer.

Accordingly, the combination of the Reitmeier patent and the Citta patent cannot result in the invention of independent claim 1. For this reason, independent claim 1 is not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Citta patent.

Moreover, the Reitmeier patent discloses a television receiver that has a look up table so that, when a user selects a virtual channel, the tuner of the television receiver is actually tuned to the physical channel that corresponds to the selected virtual channel.

A television receiver does not require a modulator that modulates a signal received on one channel to another channel for re-transmission. Accordingly, the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent is of no use to the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

Therefore, it would not have been obvious to add the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent to the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to add the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent to the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier so that a baseband signal can be coupled to a VSB digital television receiver. However, the receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent is the television receiver and is not required to re-modulate the baseband signal at the output of its demodulator to a different channel. The baseband signal is simply supplied to the audio and video decoders within the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

Accordingly, because the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent has no need for the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent, it would not have been obvious to provide the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent in the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

For this reason also, independent claim 1 is not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Citta patent.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of

the Citta patent and further in view of the Elkind patent.

The Elkind patent discloses a field of video data in Figure 1. The field includes a vertical sync and blanking interval, horizontal intervals, and an active picture area. A CRC is generated for the full field that spans from the data word fff to the data word eef. A CRC is also generated for the active picture that spans from the data word aaa to the data word eea. Both CRCs are inserted in the horizontal interval of the next field as part of the error data packet.

The Elkind patent states that certain video equipment strips the vertical sync and blanking intervals and the horizontal intervals from the video data, which results in loss of the CRCs. Therefore, the Elkind patent discloses that CRCs are placed in the active picture area.

The Reitmeier patent, the Citta patent, and the Elkind patent do not disclose a data replacer that modifies a baseband television signal by replacing a data component identifying a first selected channel with a data component identifying a second selected channel different from the first selected channel.

Accordingly, the combination of the Reitmeier patent, the Citta patent, and the Elkind patent cannot result in the invention of independent claim 1. For this reason, independent claim 1 and claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 dependent thereon are not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Citta patent and further in view of the Elkind patent.

Moreover, as discussed above, the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent has no need for the modulator disclosed in the Citta patent. Also, the Elkind patent does not suggest adding a modulator to the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

For this reason also, independent claim 1 and claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 dependent thereon are not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Citta patent and further in view of the Elkind patent.

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 13, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Elkind patent.

The Reitmeier patent and the Elkind patent do not disclose modifying a digital television signal by replacing the data component identifying a first selected

channel with a data component identifying a second, different selected channel.

Accordingly, the combination of the Reitmeier patent and the Elkind patent cannot result in the invention of independent claim 9. For this reason, independent claim 9 and claims 11, 13, 15, and 17 dependent thereon are not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Elkind patent.

Moreover, as discussed above, the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent has no need to modify a digital television signal by replacing a data component identifying a first selected channel with a data component identifying a second, different selected channel. Also, the Elkind patent does not suggest adding this function to the television receiver disclosed in the Reitmeier patent.

For this reason also, independent claim 9 and claims 11, 13, 15, and 17 dependent thereon are not unpatentable over the Reitmeier patent in view of the Elkind patent.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is clear that the claims of the present application are patentable over the references applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and issuance of the above captioned patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHIFF, HARDIN, & WAITE
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5774

By: 

Trevor B. Joike
Reg. No: 25,542

September 30, 2003